

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2010-09-18
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-08-23
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-28
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-28
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-03-27
Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-23

Agency: 021 - Department of Transportation **Bureau:** 04 - Office of the Secretary

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: DOTXX129: Delphi Version Two (originally part of OSTXX001: Delphi)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull): 021-105731835

Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

DOT is modernizing their current financial management system (DOTXX128: Delphi Version One) to better meet financial system standards, transparency requirements, and utilize the improved functionality provided by Delphi Version Two (DOTXX129: Delphi Version Two). The new Oracle Federal Financials Release 12 (Delphi Version Two) adds a new level of complexity to storage and data processing as well. This will be the first Oracle version that provides real time integration for double entry - federalized accounting generating budgetary and proprietary entries simultaneously. This new functionality is required for meeting all of DOT's requirements and needs surrounding accurate financial statement and managerial reporting. This version of Oracle is equipped with subsidiary ledger architecture that allows for recording both budgetary and proprietary accounting at the transaction level (e.g. at the appropriate accounting flex field). This new environment makes accurate and reliable reporting possible. Another functionality of Release 12 includes the complete masking of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) data, which was previously identified as an issue by the SAS 70 audit.

- 2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an**

assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.

This investment closes identified gaps around standardizing business processes across the department improving financial data management in modernizing the departments financial management systems to meet systems standards.

3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.

Current and future state business processes have been identified for grants payments as well as business and reporting requirements with the implementation of DOT electronic invoicing to Delphi. Data Cleanup has been performed on the vendor table, and e-authentication process has been defined. System testing and solution labs for DOT electronic invoicing have been accomplished. Training materials for DOT electronic invoicing are in process. DOT has identified R12 upgrade scripts, captured lessons learned from DOI current upgrade efforts to R12. DOT is examining prospect of outsourcing upgrade and hosting services to Oracle on Demand.

4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

In order to align the FSM project scope and schedule to account for several constraints, a R12 upgrade feasibility study is underway. Activities that will be performed are as follows: assembling and prioritizing lists of existing Delphi 11.5.10 customizations, performing setup and testing to new Oracle functionality sub-ledger accounting rules that will replace 11i global transaction codes, and begin creating global unit test scripts to verify R12 standard functionality. Oracle on demand will assist with the initial technical test upgrade to R12. Objectives of the test technical upgrade will include the following: determine upgrade versus re-implementation, assess impact of new R12 functionality on existing business processes, assess the impact on the existing customizations when upgrading to R12, identify potential data issues when migrating into the R12 structure, assess time to upgrade production instance and migrate data to determine feasibility of an upgrade, and determine the cost and timeline of the overall process of upgrading to R12 via multiple test iterations. Also DOT plans to have their electronic invoicing system implemented and deployed for grant payments. DOT plans to upgrade 11.5.10 to R12.

5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.

2010-06-15

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$1.3	\$3.4	\$2.9	\$1.7
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$12.9	\$8.6
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$1.2	\$1.8	\$1.9	\$3.7
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$2.5	\$5.6	\$17.7	\$14.0
O & M Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$4.2
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.8
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	0	0	0	\$6.0
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$2.5	\$5.6	\$17.7	\$20.0
Total Govt. FTE costs:	\$1.2	\$1.8	\$1.9	\$5.5
# of FTE rep by costs:	12	18	18	29
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$-3.4	\$-0.3	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		-37.28%	-1.44%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	6901	DTOS59-10-F-0046									
Awarded	6901	DTOS59-10-F-0046									
Awarded	6901	DTOS59-10-F-0046									
Awarded	6901	DTOS59-10-F-0046									
Awarded	6920	DTFAAC-08-T-0031									
Awarded	6920	DTFAAC-08-T-0031									
Awarded	6920	DTFAWA10A-0002/0001									
Awarded	6920	DTFAWA10A-0002/0001									
Awarded	6920	DTFAAC-09-C-00031									
Awarded	6920	DTFAAC-09-C-00031									

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-08-23

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
PP	Plan Phase	The first phase of the R12 upgrade where over all planning of the upgrade will take place.			
DES	Design Phase	This phase includes the first integration testing of the R12 out of the box functionality.			
BP	Build Phase	This phase includes the third integration testing of all of the customizations that have been developed thus far.			
GL	Global Phase Activities	Project management functions outside of the phases.			

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
PP	Plan Phase							
DES	Design Phase							
BP	Build Phase							

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
GL	Global Phase Activities							

Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
PP	Plan Phase	PP: SLA Management	2012-06-15	2012-06-15		112	-77	-68.75%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Testing	2012-06-21	2012-06-21		71	-71	-100.00%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Application Configuration	2012-06-29	2012-06-29		164	-63	-38.41%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: CEMLI Development	2012-06-29	2012-06-29	2012-06-29	191	0	0.00%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Infrastructure	2012-07-02	2012-07-02		305	-60	-19.67%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Instance Management	2012-08-01	2012-08-01		112	-30	-26.79%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Data Management	2012-08-07	2012-08-07		159	-24	-15.09%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Reports Management	2012-08-27	2012-08-27		87	-4	-4.60%
PP	Plan Phase	PP: Project Management	2012-10-01	2012-10-01		210	0	0.00%
DES	Design Phase	DES: SLA Management	2012-10-05	2012-10-05		158	0	0.00%
DES	Design Phase	DES: Instance Management	2012-11-09	2012-11-09		249	0	0.00%
GL	Global	Phase Independent Activities	2014-12-04	2014-12-04		1,004	0	0.00%

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
Senior management oversight & project review is impacted by the number of senior leadership reviews held throughout the FY	% of Scheduled Meetings Actually Held	Customer Results - Timeliness and Responsiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Monthly
Senior management oversight & project review is impacted by the number of senior leadership reviews held throughout the FY	% of Scheduled Meetings Actually Held	Customer Results - Timeliness and Responsiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Monthly
Senior management oversight & project review is impacted by the number of senior leadership reviews held throughout the FY	% of Scheduled Meetings Actually Held	Customer Results - Timeliness and Responsiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Monthly
Senior management oversight & project review is impacted by the number of senior leadership reviews held throughout the FY	% of Scheduled Meetings Actually Held	Customer Results - Timeliness and Responsiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Monthly
Effectiveness of project deliverables submitted based on compliance to deliverable target dates	% of Deliverables complete ontime and schedule	Mission and Business Results - Support Delivery of Services	Over target	0.900000	0.900000		0.900000	Semi-Annual
Effectiveness of project deliverables submitted based on	% of Deliverables complete ontime and schedule	Mission and Business Results - Support Delivery of Services	Over target	0.900000	0.900000		0.900000	Semi-Annual

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
compliance to deliverable target dates								
Effectiveness of project deliverables submitted based on compliance to deliverable target dates	% of Deliverables complete ontime and schedule	Mission and Business Results - Support Delivery of Services	Over target	0.900000	0.900000		0.900000	Semi-Annual
Effectiveness of project deliverables submitted based on compliance to deliverable target dates	% of Deliverables complete ontime and schedule	Mission and Business Results - Support Delivery of Services	Over target	0.900000	0.900000		0.900000	Semi-Annual
Technical Impact Analysis Results require decision point Upgrade vs. Reimplement	% of R12 Tech Upgrade is usable in ProdEnvironment	Technology - Effectiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Monthly
Functional Impact Analysis Results require decision point Upgrade vs. Reimplement	% of R12 Functionality is usable in Prod Envi	Technology - Effectiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Semi-Annual
Operational Impact Analysis Results require decision point Upgrade vs. Reimplement	% of R12 upgrade maintains operability in Prod Env	Technology - Effectiveness	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Semi-Annual
Results of Test Plan measured based on the number of Tests successfully performed without error	# of Test scenarios vs. # of tests passed	Process and Activities - Quality	Over target	0.800000	0.800000		0.800000	Semi-Annual
Customizations required to migrate to R12	% of Cust. req to operate and function is maintain	Technology - Efficiency	Over target	1.000000	1.000000		1.000000	Semi-Annual

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics								
Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency